

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:)	Confirmation No.: 5529
Akira ISHIKAWA)	
Application No. 10/827,534)	Group Art Unit: 2823
Filed: April 20, 2004)	Examiner: Jarrett J. Stark
For: SEMICONDUCTOR ELEMENT,)	
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND)	
METHODS FOR)	November 13, 2006
MANUFACTURING THEREOF)	

RESPONSE AND STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 11, 2006, and the personal interview conducted on November 21, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

On November 21, 2006, Applicant's representatives met with Examiners Stark and Estrada to discuss the pending rejections based on the Zhang patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,814,529). Applicant's representatives appreciate the Examiners' hospitality extended throughout the meeting and are grateful for the opportunity it provided to explain in detail why the Zhang patent does not describe the combinations of each and every feature set forth in independent claims 1-6, 57, 64, and 70, respectively.

As indicated in an interview summary form issued by the Examiners to Applicant's representatives, the Examiners agreed that Applicant's arguments are persuasive and that a new office action would be forthcoming. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiners' agreement to withdraw the rejections of the claims.

During the interview, Applicant's representatives pointed out that the Section 102 rejection cannot stand because claimed features recited in each of the independent claims are not found in the Zhang patent disclosure, namely: features of claims 1 and 5 relating to

forming sidewalls and etching a conductive film so that a portion of the sidewalls is exposed (the anodic oxide film relied upon in the rejection (i.e., item 509 shown in Figure 5) is removed before the conductive film 514/515 is formed and etched (see column 8, lines 1-5)); the step of “etching a portion of the etched conductive film and a portion of the source and drain regions ...,” as set forth in claim 2; steps related to forming a conductive film over the semiconductor region, etching a portion of the conductive film, and forming a resist over the conductive film, as recited in claims 3 and 6; the steps of “forming a conductive film over the semiconductor region ... etching a portion of the conductive film and a portion of the source and drain regions ... forming a resist over the conductive film ...,” as set forth in claim 4; and at least the feature that “each source electrode and drain electrode is in contact with a side surface and an upper surface of the source and drain regions,” as recited in claims 57, 64 and 70.

Additionally, it was pointed out that Zhang fails to disclose the feature of “etching a portion of the etched conductive film,” which is explicitly recited in each of claims 1, 2 and 57, and also similar features related to etching conductive films that are recited in claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 64 and 70.

If the Examiners believe the above statements do not accurately reflect subject matter discussed and agreements reached during the November 21st interview, they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below to further clarify the official record.

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and prompt notification of the same is earnestly sought.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /John F. Guay, Reg.# 47248/
John F. Guay

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8298 – Direct Telephone
(202) 585-8080 – FAX